

102(e) as being anticipated by Jebens et al. (U.S. Patent 6,321,231). Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jebens in view of Aldus Corporation, "OPI Open Prepress Interface Specification" (hereinafter "Aldus"). Applicant submits the following in traversal of the rejections.

***Rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-22, 24, 28, and 33 under § 102(e)
as being anticipated by Jebens***

Claims 1 and 6

Claims 1 and 6 describe that when the existence of a command file which instructs execution of a designated process is recognized in the prescribed folders, the process instructed by the command file is performed. The Examiner cites col. 10, lines 18-37, col. 18, lines 55-66 and col. 19, lines 14-35 for teaching this aspect of claims 1 and 6.

It appears the Examiner is referring to the image document for teaching the claimed command file. However, based on the Examiner's rejection of claims 3 and 8, the Examiner's rejection of either 1 and 6 or 3 and 8 must fall. In particular, the Examiner cited the image document for teaching the command file of claims 1 and 6, then later cited the image document for teaching the low resolution image data of claims 3 and 8.

Furthermore, the document contains image data and information pertaining to the image data. Col. 3, lines 3-6. A user's system contains many folders, each associated with a particular destination or sending site. After the document data is placed in a folder, the data is compressed and sent to the appropriate location. See Fig. 10A and col. 18, lines 48-56. Once the destination host has received the data, the data is decompressed, and stored in the host system. See Fig. 10B. The image data can later be edited by a user who retrieves the image data from the host system.

Based on the foregoing, it is apparent that the image data does not instruct execution of a designated process in the prescribed folder nor is a process performed based on instructions by the image data, as described in the present invention. Therefore, claims 1 and 6 and their dependent claims should be deemed patentable. Since claims 11 and 16 describe similar elements, claims 11 and 16 and their dependent claims should be deemed patentable for the same reasons.

Claims 3 and 8

Claims 3 and 8 describe that the command file commands execution of a designated process which is performed in the OPI system. The Examiner cites Figs. 1 and 4C and col. 5, lines 11-35 for teaching this aspect of claims 3 and 8.

Fig. 1 generally illustrates that the data management and work order delivery system of Jebens. An OPI system does not appear to be disclosed in the figure. Fig. 4C is a flow chart illustrating the autolog routine. An OPI file is created at step 232. However, there is no indication of an OPI system or that a command file commands execution of a designated process in an OPI system.

The respective column and lines cited by the Examiner describes permission rights of an agency to access certain image documents and downloading images in low resolution. The mere indication of low resolution images does not equate with an OPI system. At most, Jebens teaches that an OPI file can be created from an original image file. Col. 10, lines 53-56. There is no indication of an OPI system and the execution of a designated process in the OPI system. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 should be deemed patentable. Since claims 13 and 18 describe similar elements, they should be deemed patentable for the same reasons.

Claims 15 and 20

Claims 15 and 20 describe that the server device replaces the low resolution image data with the high resolution image data *at the time* of output. The Examiner cites Jebens Figs. 1 and 4C and col. 5, lines 15-35 for teaching claims 15 and 20.

In Jebens, once an agency has completed editing a document, the agency logs back onto the system and transmits the high resolution edited document to the host. The document can then be transmitted to another location for printing. Therefore, the low resolution image data is not replaced with the high resolution image data at the time of output, as described in claims 15 and 20.

Claim 22

Claim 22 describes that the command file comprises authentication information comprising a request to manage the prescribed folders. As previously indicated, the command file of Jebens cited by the Examiner, is merely an image data document. Although the system requests authentication information from a user before a user can log on to the system, the image data itself does not comprise authentication information. Therefore, claim 22 should be deemed patentable.

Claim 24

Claim 24 describes that the low resolution image data comprises a file name of the corresponding high resolution image data, a data location path of the high resolution image data, a folder ID of the prescribed folder in which the high resolution image is stored and a format information of the high resolution image data. The Examiner cites Jebens col. 2, last paragraph to col. 3, first paragraph and col. 8, 2nd paragraph for teaching claim 24.

The respective column and lines cited by the Examiner describes that a high and low resolution copy of digital images are stored in a searchable format. A user locates and downloads a low resolution copy of an image, an electronic file defining a document is received, and instructions regarding delivery of the file are received. A high resolution copy of the data is sent to another user for publication. There is no indication that the low resolution image data comprises the file name, data location path, folder ID and format information of claim 24. Therefore, claim 24 should be deemed patentable.

Claim 28

Claim 28 describes that the OPI daemon of the server device constantly monitors the prescribed folders of the server device. The Examiner cites col. 10, lines 18-37, col. 18, lines 55-66 and col. 19, lines 14-35 for teaching claim 28. The respective columns and lines cited by the Examiner describes the compression of documents and the transfer of image document to destination folders. There is no indication of an OPI daemon, therefore, claims 28 should be deemed patentable.

***Rejection of claim 23 under §103(a) as being unpatentable
over Jebens in view of Aldus***

The Examiner states that Jebens discloses an OPI system, however, Jebens does not teach that the OPI system comprises postscript comments. Therefore, the Examiner cites Aldus to cure the deficiency. The Examiner states that Aldus discloses that the OPI system comprises Postscript comments, citing page 6. Claim 23 should be deemed patentable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1, for the reasons set forth above.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 09/588,344

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q59305

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: March 23, 2004